THEOLOGY

VOL. XLVII APRIL, 1944 No. 286

Editorial

IN June, 1941, we expressed the hope that the Archbishops' Commission on the Training of the Ministry, which had been appointed in 1936, would produce its Report without undue delay so that its recommendations could be considered and, if favourably received, begin to be implemented before the end of the war. The Commission published an Interim Report early in 1942. We gave this a rather curt and frigid welcome, and said that we were disposed to suspend judgment on its recommendations until the Final Report was available. The Final Report has now been issued,[1] and all the articles in our present number deal with it. We take it for granted that readers of THEOLOGY will study the Report for themselves, and not be satisfied with abbreviated or partial accounts of its contents.

There is no longer an excuse for suspense of judgment concerning the Report as a whole or its main recommendations. The Commission has wisely left many consequent details open for further discussion and future decision. But it is imperative that the Convocations and the Church Assembly should decide upon the main question with the least possible delay. No ideal solution is ever possible of the kind of problems that were referred to the Commission, least of all in the present state of the Church and of society. The remarkable degree of unanimity that has been reached, after such protracted and extensive investigations, in itself makes it likely that the Commission's recommendations are the best that can possibly be made in the circumstances, and that in their main lines they are the only recommendations about which sufficient agreement can be expected to ensure their being translated into bold and prompt action. It will be fatal if the Report is pigeonholed or, what would amount to the same thing, if it becomes merely a subject for irresolute debate.

For our part, while we are not entirely satisfied with some of the Commission's theological and sociological assumptions, and while there are some topics that we could wish to have seen discussed more fully, we have no hesitation in expressing the hope that its main recommendations will be implemented. Even if we had serious misgivings as to their intrinsic excellence, like those of Fr Hebert, we should still deem it better that the Report should be acted upon as a whole than that nothing substantial should be done; and those we take to be the alternatives before the Church. At the time when the Interim Report was published, we had doubts as to the wisdom of concentrating the theological training of ordinands at universities, in view of the fact that the future development of universities and their theological

[1] Published by the Press and Publications Board of the Church Assembly. 2s. 6d.

faculties is so uncertain. But we are now satisfied that, whatever the future may have in store, a close connexion between theological training and university education—whether it be one of harmony or of tension—is desirable.

If it be granted that the main recommendations of the Commission concerning recruitment and selection, and pre-ordination and post-ordination training, must be implemented, one plain consequence among others is that the Church will have to undertake financial responsibility for this work in a way that it has not done heretofore. The annual expenditure necessary for the purpose must be given a first place on the budget of the Church Assembly. No self-respecting Church can allow the training of its clergy to be an optional charge on the money that it raises and spends, or a charge that is met only in so far as enough is left over when other charges have been met. This is an essential point. Further, it will be necessary to make an initial appeal for a large sum in order to bring into being the new institutions that are recommended. We see no reason why such an appeal should not be successful, provided it is accompanied by a clear explanation of the way in which the Church is committing itself to its bounden responsibility for the better training of its clergy.

The appeal would naturally have to be answered for the most part by the laity. It is therefore just, and in every way advantageous, that they should be given a proper share in determining what is to be done, not only through their votes in the Church Assembly, but through their representation on the regional committees which will be concerned with the selection and testing of candidates for ordination. Not the least valuable feature of the Report is the way in which it gives the laity a voice in this matter, while safeguarding the traditional rights and duties of bishops. The Commission's recommendations, in this as in other respects, point the way to what should prove to be an exemplary instance of planning, where planning is necessary, combined with provision for flexibility, variety and future change.

The same may be said of the not unrelated Report of the Archbishops' Committee on Women's Work[1], which was issued in January. If higher standards of training for the clergy are to be insisted on, including the candidates who will be trained immediately after the war, there can be little doubt that the shortage of priests will continue to become more acute for a considerable time to come. This underlines the need for preparing to make fuller use of lay men and women in the evangelistic and pastoral work of the Church. On every count, indeed, more scope ought to be provided for the laity to exercise this responsibility. Invaluable services are already being rendered by women church workers, and their services are increasingly in demand. But their recruitment and training, and the conditions of their work, have so far been very inadequately secured, and we hope that the recommendations of the Archbishops' Committee on Women's Work

[1] *Women's Work in the Church.* Published by the Press and Publications Board of the Church Assembly. 1s. An article on this subject by Miss C. R. Newby was published in THEOLOGY, March, 1942, to which we recall attention.

will be implemented alongside those of the Archbishops' Commission on the Training of the Ministry. The intention and capacity of the governing bodies of the Church to carry through well-conceived reforms are now as much on their trial as the intention and capacity of the civil government to implement plans for social reconstruction.

The Training of the Ministry

I AM grateful for this opportunity of commending the Report of the Archbishops' Commission on the Training of the Ministry to the attention of the readers of THEOLOGY. It is an opportunity which I shall try not to abuse. The chairman of a Commission must naturally take a peculiar interest in the fortunes of its Report; he has had the best means of judging the scope and variety of knowledge and opinion which have contributed to its final shape, and he probably knows as well as anyone where it is most open to attack. But everyone will certainly, in this particular instance, agree with him about the importance of the subject and the need that the Church of England as a whole should put it in the very forefront of its concerns. And I take it that the best service I can render in this article is to indicate some of the salient features of the Report, to offer some comments upon them, to deal with one or two of the more stubborn difficulties and, in all this, to attempt to be a friendly expositor rather than an advocate.

It may not be amiss if, at the outset, I refer to one or two points about the Commission itself as distinct from its final Report. Its work was begun before war broke out and had made considerable progress before a period of many months in the war's early stages during which meetings were found impracticable. When they were resumed it was soon judged desirable to prepare and publish the Interim Report (January, 1942), a brief summary of conclusions covering part of the field. This stimulated a good many useful criticisms, though too many of them did not make allowance for the fact stated in the Introductory Note that some subjects were entirely omitted and that others must be treated later at fuller length. At the Commission's own request its membership was at this stage reinforced by the addition of some valuable younger members who brought fresh minds to the preparation of the final Report. This, it must be understood, entirely replaces the Interim Report, though it will be found that the main lines of our conclusions are not greatly changed. When it is remembered that the Commission is a numerous one, that it represents many points of view, and that it has had the advantage of reconsidering its subject with the help of a contingent of new members and of the discussion of the Interim Report, it should, I think, be allowed that the final Report, issued with only one dissentient, ought to carry reasonable weight.

There are two further facts concerned with the Commission's work which have a close bearing upon the Report and should be remembered

here. We came very early to the conclusion that the Central Advisory Council for the Training of the Ministry would in future need reorganization and a whole-time chairman. Recommendation to the archbishops was made accordingly, and the new C.A.C.T.M. has now begun its work under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Maidstone. Secondly, it became clear about two years ago that special provision must be made for a host of questions relating to ordinands in the Services; this task was allotted to a special committee of the Commission. Its work rapidly became very heavy, and it was agreed on all hands that the archbishops should be asked to give it separate being. This was duly done. Now that the new C.A.C.T.M. has been formed it has taken over the functions of this Service Candidates Committee, and C.A.C.T.M. will be the main executive body which will be called, in consultation with the colleges and other bodies and persons concerned, to carry out the recommendations of the Commission as and when they are found practicable. These facts should be kept in mind by readers of our Report, because the Commission has always been aware that much detail of the greatest importance must be left to a continuing deliberative and executive body, on which the colleges are strongly represented, and has been concerned that this body should have the resources necessary for its work.

After these preliminaries I come to the Report itself. My readers need hardly be reminded that it has had many predecessors; several of these are still very well worth study, and reference to them will often reveal the persistence of the problems with which we have had to deal and the slowness of the Church in coming to a common mind about them. I believe that the distinctive features of our Report are that it makes a more resolute attempt to face the difficulties of selection; that it is more thoroughgoing in its demand for the training of the clergy in the art of teaching and for much fuller recognition of the variety of types of work which they are and will be called upon to do; and, above all, that it attempts to give post-ordination training a far more important place in the whole course and to relate it intelligibly to what has gone before. No doubt it is probable that our recommendations regarding the closer association of theological training with the universities will arouse most discussion, and I am far indeed from putting them in a secondary place. We have certainly taken a more decided and united view than previous inquirers. But discussion of this subject is a familiar feature in their reports, and plans not unlike those we propose have often been mooted before; everyone knows that they are to a considerable degree already in operation. I refrain from saying much upon this question here; it will, I know, find notice elsewhere in this issue of THEOLOGY. It would be a great misfortune if debate on this section of our scheme, easily lending itself as it does to controversy, were to crowd out full and fair reflection upon other weighty matters. Among these it is natural, here, to deal first with selection.

A just view of our proposals for regional committees can only be taken if the weaknesses of the present arrangements are known and admitted. I can say without hesitation that the Commission was

reluctant, as any body of rational beings would naturally be, to propose the constitution of yet another set of committees. But the preliminary selection of ordinands is a matter of primary importance. That selection is at present often haphazard; it is too variable in its standard; it is often too narrowly diocesan in its range; or, again, too much is allowed to depend upon acceptance of a candidate by a particular theological college. The bishops, whose responsibility must in any case be great, need the best help that can be provided for them. This provision our plan seeks to make. We recognize the delicacy of the work to be done. We do not attempt to make minute plans for the composition of the committees; these must be left to the groups of dioceses concerned. We think it reasonable to assume that the committees, when formed, will make it their first business to consider their procedure and will be guided in doing so by the need to secure that, when doubtful cases are in question, the utmost care will be taken to arrange for personal individual interviews, for the comparing of judgments independently formed, and for the securing of the best possible evidence about candidates from the persons whose special knowledge makes them best qualified to give it. The committees themselves, since each will usually represent several dioceses, will no doubt be fairly large, and there will be no lack of work for their members. But I hope that in discussion of our proposal we shall be spared the suggestion that we contemplate or have ever contemplated the proceedings taking the form of a formal *viva voce* examination! Let it be added that we have proposed a review of the plan after a term of years, when its merits and demerits can be estimated; and that in an appendix to the Report the vexed question of the bishop's responsibility in ordination receives a full treatment which will, I believe, be found to be useful.

There is not space here for more than reference to a few suggestions regarding pre-ordination training. I may take it that it was generally expected that we should recommend an additional year. This we have done, and clearly it is both an important and an expensive recommendation. It can only, I think, be fully justified and properly judged if it is considered together with the whole series of proposals bearing upon the character and the places of training, and with the plans for the post-ordination period. We were convinced that we must do all we could to avoid hurry and "cramming" in the time before ordination; we have suggested some slight reduction of the weight of G.O.E., but we found it impossible to make any great change here, though some remarks in our brief discussion of that examination and on the subject of Church History in particular will, we believe, bear good fruit if they are followed up in practice. But there are two of our recommendations to which I should like to call special attention—the requirement of a three months' course of training in teaching and our dealing with the vexed question of Greek and Latin. I must refer readers to the Report itself for details. But I may add here that hardly anything in the Report had more of our time and attention than the former of these, and that the latter too was most thoroughly discussed. It was a disappointment to us that we could not be more

precise about the conditions under which the three months' course of training in teaching should be given; we made many inquiries, but the prospects of the training colleges in such respects as accommodation and staffing after the war are so uncertain that definite plans cannot yet be laid down in detail. We have said all we could, and we are united in believing that the need we have indicated is among our greatest and that it cannot be met adequately by a less stringent requirement. The rule we have urged relating to the study of Greek and Latin is intended to maintain their study as vigorously as possible and to guard against "soft options." But it also recognizes the special circumstances of candidates who have had a predominantly scientific training, and of older candidates generally. This is a question upon which opinions wax strong; we hope that we have held the balance fairly in the best interests of the Church.

Our aim throughout our dealing with the subject of training has been to keep in mind the need for a thorough theological grounding and for help in relating that to the varied tasks and opportunities of the Church in the modern world. It is recognized that there must and ought to be a common basis of training, whether a man hopes to work in town or country mainly, or to go overseas, or to give much of his time to one of the special branches of ministerial work, for which there is already, and will increasingly be, strong demand. Yet there ought to be also more facilities, in the types of course provided, for giving a "bias" in accordance with the special interests and capacities of the men concerned. There is no one sovereign way of making this provision. But there will be found in the Report many contributions towards it. One obvious requirement is that all places of training should be adequately staffed, and this has been much in our minds, not only in specific statement, but in our general plan for a closer link with the universities old and new. Another is that definite effort should be made to discover, train, and make financial provision for the use of special gifts, and that far more generous opportunity should be given to men, early in their ordained life, to think out with others the meaning of their experience and to refresh their spiritual and intellectual being.

This brings us to the great subject of post-ordination training. Here, again, we have tried, I hope with some success, to combine some general rules with the fullest recognition and welcome of variety in detail. Our main principle has been that the three years after ordination should be regarded as a time during which men need definite help and supervision and that, about the end of this time, if possible at the end of their first curacy, they should for three months go to centres specially provided where they can win that refreshment and that opportunity for reflection, discussion and re-dedication which must always be desirable and is at present, save for short and inadequate periods, generally unobtainable. More than this, we have urged that in the dioceses directors of training should be appointed to keep in close touch with men during these years and, when necessary, to have the help of other clergy of experience in advising and guiding them. I need hardly tell readers of THEOLOGY that a plan of this kind already

has experience behind it. It provides a framework upon which dioceses can build according to their particular circumstances, geographical and otherwise. Clearly the director of training must be in close touch with the bishop and clearly also there must be no forgetfulness of the fact that the incumbent under whom a deacon or young priest is serving can help him more than anyone else, and very commonly does. But there must be recognition too that the Church, as represented by the diocese, has a responsibility for the younger clergy which must be maintained against the natural but dangerous tendency to regard them as the property of particular parishes. We have not failed to note and to insist that all schemes for improvement along these lines are most clearly related to the pressing need for more large staffs under men skilled in training them. The Church is going to be gravely understaffed for many years to come, but we could make far better use of the men we have and are likely to have. We have made the important and, I believe, essential suggestion that an immediate inquiry should be made into the number of clergy we need in the next ten years; only when that need is known with some approach to accuracy can we make wise plans for meeting it as far as it can be met; part of the wisdom of any plan will certainly consist in determined refusal to consent to lower standards. We have recommended, too, that the Church should face the whole question of recruitment with more initiative and decision; when we know our need we must actively call men to meet it.

These paragraphs are intended only to call attention to a few features of the Report. I may be allowed to close with some general reflections. The Report will no doubt receive its full share of criticism. This is to be welcomed, provided the critics remember the seriousness of the weaknesses which the Church must remedy. The warmest recognition of the debt owed to the theological colleges ought not to blind us to those weaknesses, though it should certainly prevent us from placing the responsibility for them upon the colleges alone or mainly. The fundamental weakness is the lack of adequate supply of the best material; but neither selection, testing, nor training is at present satisfactory. It is certain that any honest inquiry would reveal these facts, however various the remedies it might suggest. I think, too, that any such inquiry would find, as we have found, that for the lack of supply there is no simple short-term remedy, but that there is certainly need for active, many-sided attempts to bring the case home to the Church at large. And over the rest of the field of debate there is likely, I hope and believe, to be at least a large measure of general agreement. The present issue of THEOLOGY will illustrate some points of difference which must not be minimized. But that the methods of selection should be more exacting, that training should be longer and more coherent, that adequate staffing and equipment of all places of training must be secured, that there must be more scope for the development and use of special gifts, that the post-ordination period must be regarded as an essential part of the whole "lay-out" of the training scheme, that the needs of the whole Church at home and overseas and the nature of our society and its characteristic

pressures must be kept always in mind—about all this and a good deal else there seems little room for doubt. The matters at stake are so important and so urgent that there is ground for appeal to Churchmen not to allow a wide measure of agreement to be forgotten or overlaid in the excitement of disputes on points of difference. No doubt there will be plenty of temptation for the ecclesiastical gladiators, and some of them have been heard whetting their swords. It will be well, then, to remember that the Commission, itself representative of wide diversity of opinion, has considered during several years a great mass of fact and suggestion and has come at last to a general agreement upon the bearing of it all. It recognizes that the working-out in detail of its recommendations must be the co-operative task of C.A.C.T.M., the colleges, the faculties of theology, the dioceses, and many other bodies and persons; it recognizes too that on many questions, notably the training of older men, who may often be non-graduates, it has been able to do little more than emphasize the infinite diversity of such cases and the need for individual treatment of them. On the other hand it has become increasingly aware that we cannot afford to scatter our resources for theological training in so large a number of isolated centres, and that we must in more ways than one work for the creation of strong theological schools and of places where there may be thinking as well as teaching in the service of the worldwide Church. The Report holds that without vigorous movement in this direction we shall fail to judge rightly of our opportunity.

ALWYN DUNELM:

Means and Ends

THE Report of the Archbishops' Commission on the Training of the Ministry will no doubt provoke criticisms, and it is the purpose of this paper to criticize it.[1] But it would be a disaster if the result of the criticisms that will be made were to be the defeat of its positive and constructive proposals; notably, as I think, the following. First, there needs to be some preliminary selection of men for training. (It is not right that any man should in effect constitute himself a candidate for the Ministry, either through commanding sufficient money to pay for his own training or by his persistence in knocking at doors where grants may be obtained. Whoever he be, he ought to be accepted first by some responsible authority, and then tested by the way he shapes during his training, before he finally becomes a candidate for ordination.) Second, it is to be hoped that no considerations of economy or rush of Service candidates will be allowed to

[1] The circumstances in which this paper comes to be written are as follows: I was from the beginning a member of the Commission, and attended all its sessions. No minority report emerged; but at the last session I presented a memorandum, the substance of which reappears in this paper, declaring myself willing to assent to the Report with the reservations here indicated. The Commission, not unnaturally, was unwilling for the memorandum to be printed with the Report, and desired me to seek publicity for my criticisms elsewhere.

reverse the Commission's addition of a year to the time of training. (Hitherto the work of most theological colleges has to a large extent been ruined by the pressure of work for the G.O.E. Thereby the study, for the sake of which the exam exists, is spoilt by the simple fact that when the time allowed at the college is the minimum in which it is possible for men to be prepared for the exam, no time is left to them to stop and think what it all means; and this is peculiarly fatal when the subject that is being studied is the Word of Life.) Third, the requirement of residence in one or other of certain prescribed colleges should eliminate the various correspondence courses which have reduced cramming to a fine art. Fourth, the Report contains some admirable proposals for post-ordination training.

This positive endorsement of these recommendations of the Commission is the background of the criticisms that follow. These concern two points only; for I will not stop to notice points of detail, with regard to which probably every member of the Commission has some reservations to make. The first relates to the principles of the training itself; the second to the proposed regional committees.

The first is this. Means exist for the sake of ends, and the ends need to be discussed first in order that the right means may be adopted for their attainment; but the Commission, while incorporating in its Report certain statements of the principles governing theological study (see especially §§ 77, 78, 93), has not set itself seriously to implement these principles, nor are its practical proposals framed in the light of them. If such a discussion of principle had been seriously undertaken and carried through, the Report would certainly not have been unanimous, but could hardly have failed to be a document of permanent importance.

The problem may be analysed under these three headings:

(*a*) What constitutes vocation? There is first the fundamental principle of the essential sanctity of every honest way of life, and the relation of the priesthood to all those other vocations. With regard to this special vocation, there is the call of God, consisting in His purpose for a man's life; but how is that call known? A man's belief that he is called by God does not prove it, since various disturbing psychological factors come in, but needs to be checked by the judgment of others qualified to judge, especially those in charge of his training. Finally, there is the call, definite and irreversible, which the Church itself gives in the act of ordination. There is much here needing to be disentangled.

(*b*) What is the priestly character that needs to be formed? What part is played in the formative process by the life of study and of prayer on the one hand, and by contact with the world and everyday life on the other?

(*c*) In both these respects, what are the special merits of the universities and of the Church's own theological colleges respectively? In what ways does university education need to be criticized, both generally as education, and in particular from the point of view of the training of ordinands? And what are the true aims of a theological college, and how far have the existing colleges achieved those aims? Are

there some removable hindrances which have prevented them from doing so?

The Commission would have rendered an outstanding service to the Church if it had in all these matters discussed systematically the relation of means to ends. But it is typical of the Report that, while it nowhere deals with the question of the relation of university and theological college, it shows its awareness that the question exists by recommending the establishment of more theological colleges in university centres (§ 97), in an optimistic hope that this plan will combine the advantages of both without the disadvantages. It would be possible to have more confidence in this recommendation if it had been based upon an adequate analysis of the problem. It is further typical of the Report that it lays down almost as a self-evident proposition that a university degree is generally desirable, and recommends that a degree be required of all candidates accepted below the age of twenty (§ 99); yet in two places (§ 43 and the quotation in § 82) things are said about the secularization of the universities today which might suggest that they are no fit places for the training of ordinands; and no explanation is given of this discrepancy.

It is impossible here to do more than deal briefly with the relation between the university and the theological college as places of theological study. In § 93 of the Report there is an excellent division of theological study into five branches: historical criticism, philosophical discussion, the history of doctrine, dogmatic theology from the standpoint of one or another of the Christian confessions, and finally the study of the Gospel of God as Gospel, "from faith to faith," as when the Bible is studied as the Word of God addressed to each individual soul. In the first three of these there can be no doubt that the universities excel; but the last two fall under the responsibility not of any university, but only of the Church. Thus, for instance, neither Oxford nor Manchester University would be willing or could be allowed to accept responsibility for teaching either Anglican or Roman Catholic or Presbyterian dogmatic theology, nor yet for the preaching of the Word of God; for these things are the Church's concern, however many members of the Church who are zealous apologists or gifted preachers may be found among the university lecturers. But it is precisely these subjects, dogmatic theology and the Gospel message, which constitute the core of theology proper; in relation to these, the other three subjects are but prolegomena. As prolegomena they are indispensable: criticism, for the rigid scrutiny of the events on which the Gospel message is based; philosophy, for the correct statement of the ultimate questions about God and man to which the revelation of God in Christ indicates the final answer (and to a wrongly stated question no right answer can be given); and the history of doctrine, for the study of the different forms of theological belief, lest those which are temporary and local should be allowed to claim universal and final authority. These are "objective" studies, in the sense that the same conclusions can be reached about them by men of differing religious belief or none at all; hence they can be and are adequately studied in the modern secularized university. But they are indispensable to the study of theology proper,

and men of firm religious conviction are found in the universities giving and receiving instruction in them.

For theology proper the university cannot become responsible; all that it can do is to offer facilities to the Church (or, as we must say nowadays, the denomination) to give denominational teaching or preaching within its walls. Dogmatic theology and preaching always imply the existence of a religious society of some sort which carries them on. When these things are done in some confessional group within the university some minister of the denomination concerned will be in charge of them; but the ideal condition for their thorough and systematic prosecution is an institution whose whole life is based on a faith confessed in common and centred in a college chapel. It follows that the Church must possess theological colleges for the training of the men for its ministry, since it is absolutely bound to take the greatest care, not only that every ordinand shall have an adequate knowledge of the belief of which he is to be an authorized teacher, but also that (as is most fully expressed in the great exhortation in the rite for the ordination of priests) each one shall know in his own experience what the Gospel of God means.

For these two things, doctrine and faith, constitute the central element, of primary and unique importance, in the training of a priest. At the same time the other three branches of theological study are not optional additions; they too are indispensable in their subordinate place, just because the Truth of God is not some form of words that has come to men direct from heaven, but has been mediated through history and appropriated by human minds. Therefore all humanistic studies have relation to theology; and it is impossible to grasp aright the divine treasure without a true understanding of the limitations of the earthen vessels which contain it. Wherever this distinction is neglected divine authority and absolute value come to be assigned to opinions of men.

Hence in all training of men for the Ministry all the five branches of theological study must take their due place. But it does not follow that all types of mind will require them in the same proportion. Doctrine and faith must indeed take the first place, for all candidates, and must be studied in a theological college; and the course of studies must be of such a character that justice is done also to the humanistic side. But the amount of critical, philosophical and historical study of which different types of men are capable varies very much. The "general practitioner" needs to have a fair working knowledge of these subjects, and is capable, under proper tuition, of grasping the broad lines of biblical criticism, of seeing the fallacy of hedonism, of taking an intelligent view of Reformation theology. The "scholar" type, on the other hand, takes a spontaneous interest in these things, and is constantly found instituting lines of research on his own initiative. It is this latter type that deserves to read for honours at the university; and, unless I am very much mistaken, the university authorities would be heartily glad to be relieved of the presence of men of the other type in the honour schools. If men of that type go to the university at all, they should not read for honours.

The practical scheme to which this analysis leads would seem to be this: that corresponding to the General Ordination Examination there needs to be a General Ordination Course, of either three (Report, § 100*b*) or four (§ 103) years, to be taken in one of the Church's theological colleges. It is true that such a course cannot be provided to order, at a few weeks' notice; it can only be built up slowly, as the syllabus of lectures is worked out by experience, and the staff trains itself in giving them. Yet it is but the enlargement of what the theological colleges have been doing; and now that they are to have at least an extra year, is it not a golden opportunity to call on these colleges, the rise of which in the last three generations has represented a very notable spiritual effort on the part of the Church to provide a worthy training for the priesthood, to lengthen their cords and strengthen their stakes? They are now to be set free from the first of the major hindrances which have been preventing them from fulfilling their own ideal—the shortness of time and the consequent ruin of study; they should be set free also from the second hindrance, shortness of staff, through being assisted to provide additional tutors, and also perhaps through grouping of colleges (§ 95), if this plan receives approval.

Many clergy have testified to the immense value of the time spent in a theological college; it was there that they learnt for the first time to see the Christian faith as a whole, and to accept it as making a single and absolute demand on the service of their whole lives. What is meant by this is not only, or chiefly, that a man reaches a point of view from which he can systematize his opinions; it is much more that he himself is transformed, through the re-orientation of his life from the point of view of God's purpose for him, through working out in all his thinking and his habits a right response to God's claim on him, through beginning to learn the mind of Christ. God has many ways of teaching His children the lessons that He will have them to learn; every man must learn these lessons in his own way; nothing in the nature of mass-production is possible. Nevertheless it has been the experience of very many that it has been a great, even an indispensable, help to go apart from the busy life of a university, with its many interests and distractions, to the simpler and less crowded life of a "detached" theological college in the country.[1]

In other words, an element of segregation from the world is an important part of the training. But there is another element which needs to come in if there is to be a right balance of the sacred and the secular. First, it is necessary that the outlook of the studies should be broad; there needs to be, in the true sense of the term, a sceptical spirit, an awareness of and a sympathy with all genuine difficulties, a sustained endeavour to see the Christian answer in relation to the problems of the world. The evil of the so-called "seminarist spirit" is that it is an escapism which refuses to do this. But theology, properly treated,

[1] It is worth remarking that many secular educational institutions know the benefit of getting their pupils away into the country and out of range of the cinema and other attractions of the city.

is the broadest of all subjects, having relation to every sort of knowledge and every way of life in the world which God has created and redeemed. Hence, secondly, the period of segregation needs as its complement a period when the ordinand mixes with the world; it is necessary for him to learn to see the Christian Gospel in direct relation to the world's need. Those of the scholar type would do this best by plunging into the intellectual life of a university; others might usefully go there too and read for a pass degree or a diploma. But many of the "general practitioner" type might spend their time more usefully otherwise, getting a thorough training in the art of teaching by joining a training college (*cf.* the Report, § 113), or going in for missionary study at Selly Oak (§ 123), or working in a factory (§ 116), or spending a year on a farm (§ 119). For them, such occupations could as truly be called "specialization" as the scholar's immersion in New Testament studies.

And here I would make a suggestion which is not indeed essential to the argument, but follows naturally from it, and which has been advocated for forty years in the community to which I belong—namely, that the period of specialization, at the university or elsewhere, should follow and not precede the theological course. It seems obvious enough; a member of the medical profession who specializes has always first gained a general knowledge of the physiology of the body as a whole. Only in our theological education is it not the habitual order; yet it is adopted by Wesley House at Cambridge, and at Oxford by Mansfield College and three Roman Catholic religious orders which have houses of study there for selected students who have completed their ordinary theological course elsewhere. We Anglicans might well make experiments along this line, while recognizing that with us such an order of studies will never become universal, since there will no doubt always be some men who will not decide to seek ordination till they are already undergraduates. Such an order has great advantages. The man who has been through his theology will be of more use as a Christian among his fellow-men, whether at the university or elsewhere; while the young and ignorant Christian is always liable to withdraw into a small clique of religiously minded young men, for fear lest he should lose the faith that he has, the man who has done his studies and knows where he stands will be all eager to meet in real life the views of which he has heard in his lectures. In all cases men who had thus specialized would return to their original theological college for six months before their ordination, primarily for their own good, but also for that of the college.

I would submit that a scheme such as this would do far better justice to the actual problem of making a man fit to serve as a priest in the Church of God than the Commission's plan of bringing as many theological colleges as possible to university centres. It is to be feared that under such a plan men would not get the best out of either the theological college or the university.

My second point concerns the preliminary selection of candidates for training. At the sessions of the Commission, I never accepted the proposed Regional Committees as the right means to that end. But

I want to be constructive; and I will set out first a suggestion for the solution of the problem on what I am sure is the right line—namely, that as the diocese is the unit of the Church, and the bishop its chief pastor in each place, selection of men for training ought to be organized on a diocesan basis.

All the materials necessary for such a solution can be found in the Report of the Commission. Each diocese is to have a director of training, who will be responsible under the bishop for the oversight both of the diocesan ordinands (§ 53) and of the newly ordained (§ 133), having associated with him for the former purpose the Diocesan Training Committee, and for the latter, at least in the larger dioceses, a number of supervisors, "clergy of experience and special capacity," to guide the studies of deacons and junior priests. It is not well to multiply organizations and officials; and the qualities which fit men to be supervisors of junior clergy would equally fit them to look after ordinands during their training, and to interview them when they apply in the first place. These men, with the bishop, the director of training, the archdeacons, and the secretary of the diocesan finance, could form an Ordination Council; this Council would accept candidates, assign grants, advise about the course of their training, drop from the list those who proved unsatisfactory, and finally advise the archdeacon, whether of that diocese or another, to present those approved for ordination. These same persons would be well qualified to continue to look after those of the diocesan candidates who were ordained in the diocese, as well as those who came into it from elsewhere; for while every applicant ought to be obliged to seek acceptance in the first place in the diocese in which his home is situated, no diocese should have the right to claim the services after ordination of the men whom it had given to the priesthood of the Church. In general, it is not well that a man should start his ministerial work in a place too near his home.

The importance of such a scheme is that the relations of the candidate to Church authority will be throughout personal. He will be personally known to the bishop, the director of training, and some of the other members of the Ordination Council; and it has been customary in at least one diocese to bring together all the diocesan candidates, so far as possible, once a year for conference and social intercourse. Under such a scheme, those who have been responsible for advising a man's acceptance in the first place will have the opportunity of reviewing their decisions, in some instances no doubt with regret; and thus they will in time become really competent in judging the qualities of applicants. But the members of Regional Committees would only in rare cases be able to keep in touch with the men they had accepted; in any case the large numbers passing through their hands would make it all but impossible for them to do so. This would be a very serious thing. An opposition party in Parliament criticizes the Government with a due sense of responsibility when it knows that it may itself have to take office; and similarly a principal of a college, when interviewing applicants, can never forget that he will have to live with the men whom he accepts. But the members of Regional

Committees will have power without responsibility; and these committees may easily become ugly instances of bureaucracy, that typical and besetting evil of modern civilization. Furthermore, they appear to be unnecessary, since the dioceses ought to be able to select their candidates very much better.

But would they? The general testimony about the Diocesan Training Committees has not been good; indeed, I think it was because these committees had been unsatisfactory that the proposal of Regional Committees was first made. Yet the Report proposes to keep these diocesan committees in being for the purpose of giving grants and for general oversight of the candidates (§§ 47 and 53). The proposal which I am making here involves their complete reconstitution, or rather the ending of the old committees and a new start with a different name, a fresh basis, and mainly fresh personnel. It can well be that a large part of the failure of the old committees (in so far as they have failed) has been due to the fact that they have mainly been occupied with allotting grants, and have had little encouragement to gain a wider vision. The Commission has done well, in any case, to propose, at the conclusion of the chapter on Selection, that whatever plan is adopted shall come up for reconsideration by the Church after a period of years.

A. G. Hebert, S.S.M.

Training and Environment

When two years ago the Commission on Training for the Ministry issued an Interim Report, it was natural that criticism should centre around two changes foreshadowed in that report—the creation of Regional Committees for selection and the grouping of colleges at university centres. Such criticism was carefully considered by the Commission, which, in reviewing its decisions, had an opportunity to receive further representations from the Principals' Conference. It is implicit throughout the section on Training in the final Report that such questions as the relation of theological faculties to the training of Anglican students and the value of a period of segregation before ordination were fully discussed. In his article "Means and Ends" published elsewhere in this number Father Hebert adopts the same line of criticism, and his memorandum, coming from the one member of the Commission who does not sign the Report, will claim attention, and calls for some answer. It would be bold for a layman to enter the lists with a theologian, but a closer scrutiny reveals that the points at issue are not strictly theological. A lay member of the Commission will have approached his task with no personal attachment to any form of training; he has not lived so close to the picture that he cannot see the wood for the trees; he will be fully conscious that in a revolutionary epoch "the religious life is started upon a fresh period in company with radically new ideas," that the Church is faced with a missionary problem and must, if she is to win the mind of England, permeate every sphere where thinking men and women are reshaping

their ideas. It is on this background that the Commission's proposal should be studied; as is admirably stated in § 14 of the Report, evangelism today calls for special qualities of spiritual leadership, and this has a direct bearing on the selection of candidates and the provision for their training.

The case for Regional Committees is temperately stated in the Report; the present lack of any system or standard in selection stands condemned, and its bad effect on recruitment cannot be ignored. The hope is expressed that "laymen who have had a special experience in judging the qualities of young men" will be members of these committees. To estimate a candidate's qualities of leadership, he should be judged beside other young men of his generation, and in forming such a judgment the right laymen might have a wider experience than their clerical colleagues: it can hardly be suggested that at this preliminary stage of selection laymen would prove more fallible judges of such gifts as sincerity, virility, and intellectual alertness.

These committees Father Hebert describes as unnecessary, irresponsible and bureaucratic. This last epithet, which can always arouse prejudice, illustrates the instinctive reaction when authority intervenes to check any uncontrolled freedom of action. More control is obviously needed, and no one's legitimate freedom of action is menaced. The right of Principals to reject candidates is specifically recognized. Nor is it generous to suggest that a sense of responsibility will only be found in those who have charge of a man's training; even they will not be the people eventually affected by the character of a man's ministry. The alternative proposal ignores the difficulty of maintaining any standard of selection on a diocesan basis, but the writer is reluctant to disturb the existing ill-regulated relations between dioceses and colleges, for fear possibly of weakening the influence of the colleges in selection; he therefore adopts the councils which the Report suggests should be reconstituted in every diocese to supervise training, and assigns to them the supplementary task of selection. This scheme, which by certain inconsistencies shows signs of hasty improvisation, does nothing to meet the objections to a diocesan system of selection; the ill effects of "local pressure" may still be felt and the free interchange of candidates between dioceses continue to be hampered.

The other issue raised is less complicated than it is made to appear. Father Hebert advocates the training of all candidates other than those of the "scholar type" (a distinction imperfectly defined) in the seclusion of an isolated college for an unbroken period of four years, on the ground that thus only can a true foundation of doctrine and faith be laid; to check the obvious danger of engendering the seminarist spirit, a short period may be superimposed on this training, when the student follows some other occupation away from the college; it is rather surprising to find that the voluntary alternatives suggested include a course of training in teaching which the Commission has decided is essential for all ordinands. This proposal is of course not a constructive amendment but a direct negative to the recommendation of the Report which advises that all candidates should begin their training at a college in a university centre; if a candidate feels the need

of a period of greater seclusion he could, under advice, transfer at a later stage in his training to a detached college. One may regret that Father Hebert has made no attempt to answer any of the arguments on the other side; he appears to treat them as irrelevances and instead criticizes the Commission more than once for evading issues and refusing to implement their own principles. His contention reads like the protest of a speaker after a debate who declares that, if his own point of view had been argued more exhaustively, possibly to the exclusion of any other consideration, the result of the discussion must have been different. A Commission that has given six of the last seven years to this problem might think itself immune from any charge of forming superficial judgments. To say that the principles governing theological study could only be implemented in the way outlined in "Means and Ends" would appear to beg the whole question. The success in special conditions of one type of community life is no criterion of the merits of other systems of training; and to present the issue as lying between university theological teaching and that of the detached college is surely to raise a false antithesis and to ignore the existence and achievements of those colleges already at university centres—more than a third of the total number. A detailed analysis of the process of a theological education could only emphasize the part that environment plays in all education; it would show that the disciplined life of a small society helps a man to concentrate on "seeing the Christian faith as a whole" and "the re-orientation of his life"; it would also bring out, as the Report shows in § 85, that through a wider experience the student will see more clearly the true relevance of the devotional life.

The Commission recognized that the shortcomings in the existing system of training could not be remedied entirely by an extension of time. The motives that actuated them in recommending that colleges should be grouped at university centres are set out in the Report, and it is well to call attention to some of these, as Father Hebert's silence may have a significance. They wish to strengthen the teaching power of the colleges by making available all the resources of the Church and to plan for the increase of those resources; while providing the disciplined life within the narrower circle of a college, they would be anxious that ordinands should in the wider society outside have the opportunity to rub shoulders with their contemporaries, men with varied ideas and aspirations and with minds possibly trained on a different method; that they should find themselves in the society of other ordinands with a different point of view or of Christians of another denomination—in a word, that they should learn "to be as humble towards the convictions of others as they are sure of their own." The Commission is not insensitive to the risks some would foresee in such an environment, the dangers arising from a spirit of premature criticism or from the distractions of university life, but it considers it undesirable that throughout his training a man should be deliberately sheltered from all such contacts, and lose the inspiration that is to be found even in the secularism that surrounds a modern university in an industrial city no less than in the tradition of a cathedral

or the culture of an older university. In this respect the Commission urges that all should be treated alike, and draws no distinction between graduates and non-graduates; with the spread of education and amidst the conflict of ideologies this can hardly be the moment to accentuate such distinctions or for the Church to be content that any of her clergy should have a narrower or less liberal education; even the "general practitioner," to use Father Hebert's phrase, requires clinical instruction as well as a knowledge of anatomy and physiology. The end the Commission has had in view has been to equip a man to fulfil his ministry in the conditions of the modern world, and in the changed and changing conditions of our times would appear the justification for a constructive and progressive policy.

F. S. Preston.

Haslemere.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Christian Faith: an Introduction to Dogmatic Theology. By C. B. Moss. S.P.C.K. 16s.

Dr S. C. Carpenter wittily remarked, in his Editorial in Theology in July, 1939, *à propos* of the then recent rejection by the Lower House of Canterbury Convocation of a proposal to revise the Thirty-nine Articles, that "the form of assent [to the Articles] was in 1865 deliberately made general, but, even so, the older clergy, broadly speaking, have assented to Gibson, and the younger to Bicknell." It is, at the moment of writing, a quarter of a century to the very month since the first edition of Bicknell appeared, and in such a period even the most useful of books may be expected, in spite of subsequent revision, to have got somewhat out of date. The wrapper of Dr Moss's book asserts that some of the best books on dogma "suffer from being based on the 39 Articles," and, while not altogether acquiescing in the disparagement of the Articles which the rather cutting word "suffer" implies, it was with an eagerness not lessened by the fact that both Bicknell's book and Dr Moss's are based on the courses in dogmatic theology which they delivered as lecturers at the Scholæ Cancellarii, Lincoln, that the present reviewer turned to Dr Moss's work in the expectation that the priest who slew the slayer had himself been slain. If our conclusion is that Bicknell has not been superseded, this must not be taken to imply that theological students and parish priests will be ill-advised in purchasing this book.

The limitations under which a book of this nature necessarily labours are obvious. It is inevitable that conclusions will be stated without the case for them being fully argued or the objections to them fully met. It would be unfair to accuse Dr Moss of superficiality on this score. It is, however, regrettable that, in a work whose lay-out is not prescribed by the arrangement of the Thirty-nine Articles, little over a tenth is devoted to the doctrine of God, while the discussion of the doctrine of Man is confined entirely to the historical controversies about the Fall, the manner of the Atonement, predestination and

justification. The book therefore needs supplementing by other works, if the student is to be adequately equipped to state the Faith relevantly in the face of the tremendous scepticism of the present day; it is unfortunate that Dr Moss was unable, through shortage of paper, to give a bibliography of the principal modern discussions on these matters. What we fail to find here—and what is so badly needed—is an exposition of the Catholic religion in all its architectonic power and intellectual splendour as the supremely coherent and comprehensive doctrine about God, the world and man, in which the details would be seen in their true relation to the great central theme of creation and redemption. It is perhaps unfair to ask for this in a textbook, but it is at least disappointing to find no adequate discussion of the relation of the natural to the supernatural order, a strictly theological question which is involved in one form or another in almost every question which the priest today is called upon to face.

Needless to say, Dr Moss has performed his task with great thoroughness and erudition. It is difficult to know where else one can turn to find so compact and detailed a statement of an interpretation of the Catholic Faith that might be described as a little higher than Bicknell and a little lower than the Angel of the Schools. No one can object to Dr Moss's determination to make his position clear. But if truth has its rights, charity has its duties, and, as Fr Barker of Mirfield has remarked in *C.R.*, in a review which says all that really need be said on this score, "it is unfortunate that the first summary of dogmatic theology to appear for many years should be marred by the spirit of contention."

One or two small points may be made. The exposition of the Eucharistic Sacrifice lays little stress on the showing forth of the Lord's *death* (see, *e.g.*, Mr A. M. Farrer's criticisms of the late Dr Hicks in his essay in *The Parish Communion*). The discussion of the development of the Papacy might well have been supplemented by a discussion of the development of the episcopate, and of what Dom Gregory Dix has well called the "clericalization" of the Body of Christ. There are many instances in which a clearer consciousness of the truths that underlie the Liturgical Movement, both Anglican and Roman, might have given greater coherence and added persuasiveness; but one cannot ask for everything in under five hundred pages. We repeat that Dr Moss's book is a valuable and encyclopedic compilation which both students and the clergy will be wise to buy; but there will still be a place for F. J. Hall's ten-volume *Dogmatic Theology* and for Darwell Stone's handier *Outlines of Christian Dogma*.

LINCOLN. E. L. MASCALL.

THE REGISTER OF ARCHBISHOP CHICHELE. Vol. I. Edited by E. F. Jacob. Clarendon Press.[1] 15s.

The appearance of Professor Jacob's first volume of the four projected volumes of Archbishop Chichele's Register (of which the second

[1] Issued to members of the Canterbury and York Society in March-June, 1941.

has already been published) brings the long-awaited Introduction in which he surveys the career of that primate and analyses the chief contents of the *Register*. At the outset it must be said that this survey combines enjoyment with profitable instruction. It is magisterial and fascinating, both in its biographical aspects and as an illustration of the *Anglicana Ecclesia* during the first half of the fifteenth century. The Introduction is a work of great compression, and few of its pages can be read quickly; but the reader is left with many new items of detailed information and with an authoritative general conspectus of a vital period in ecclesiastical history.

Chichele himself rose to high ecclesiastical office by the customary legal and administrative career, attended by the usual pluralities of minor preferment, being drawn into the household of Bishop Medford of Salisbury and possessing also useful family connexions among the aldermen of the city of London. His advancement to the episcopate, first as bishop of St David's ("admittedly a stepping-stone to higher things, a source of income for an absentee administrator or diplomat") and thence to Canterbury was the reward of his association with the house of Lancaster. His primacy was contemporaneous with an important stage in the Anglo-French war on the one hand (involving heavy taxation of the clergy to support this war) and with the final stages of the Conciliar movement and the resultant victory of the papacy on the other (which in turn involved heavy demands on the clergy by way of papal provisions). Pressed between these upper and nether millstones, Chichele's position was far from easy or enviable. His loyalty to the English monarchs led him into difficulties with the popes; and one of the most important of Dr Jacob's sections deals with the vexed problems of papal provisions and Chichele's reactions thereto. It is clear that Chichele was too good an Englishman to find favour with the papacy: "his heart was in the business of the kingdom"; and he incurred papal reprisals by a temporary suspension of his legatine powers.

As is natural, on the grounds alike of *pietas* and history, Dr Jacob gives a full account of the archbishop's zeal for clerical education at Oxford, especially in respect of his foundation of All Souls College. In the detailed survey of his ecclesiastical administration many points invite comment because of their interest and importance, if space allowed a like fullness in review; but only a few can be selected in the hope that the appetite of readers of THEOLOGY may be whetted in order to be delighted by Dr Jacob's detailed fare. Thus it is exceedingly interesting to observe that, notwithstanding Chichele's many other avocations and his employment of episcopal assistance in his diocesan administration, the majority of ordinations before 1435 were held by the archbishop in person. Naturally the majority were held (on the average twice or thrice a year) in or near London; and an item of especial interest is the number of occasions on which Chichele ordained for other diocesans, and not only from his own province. "The archbishop's London ordinations had therefore a decidedly provincial complexion. . . . In these lists the presence of clerks from the northern province should be noted. It is a reminder that the ordi-

nations of the later medieval archbishops were by no means confined to their own diocese. It was as Catholic bishops that they conferred orders."

By Chichele's time the right of the archbishop to hold metropolitical visitations had been admitted, and Dr Jacob's essay gives valuable detailed evidence of the primate's activities in this regard. The heavy taxation needed by the Crown for the prosecution of its French campaigns made Chichele's primacy a period of important development in the history of his Provincial Convocation; and interesting glimpses are given of occasions when, by the withdrawal of the *prelati religiosi* for separate consultation, "convocation presents the spectacle of three groups or estates rather than of two houses." But this experiment did not take root; and the traditional division into two houses of prelates and inferior clergy became so settled that "Chichele's pontificate saw the prolocutor develop into practically a standing official of convocation." Heavy taxation raised insoluble problems concerning the staffing of poor benefices; and Chichele's attention was divided between the equally complex questions of augmenting poor vicarages and securing preferment for graduates as opposed to non-graduate clerks.

These items represent but a few among many which the reader would wish to illustrate and consider; but they may (it is hoped) be sufficient to send many to the full perusal of Dr Jacob's Introduction. The present reader came to Chichele after spending some time with the MSS of Wake's primacy three hundred years later; and the fascinating study of Dr Jacob has assisted him materially both by the similarities and contrasts between the two primacies, as well as emphasizing certain invincible common characteristics of the English character as reflected in the *Anglicana Ecclesia* alike under papal and royal headship. Dr Jacob's Introduction can be recommended warmly to all students of ecclesiastical history, who will find it equally edifying and entrancing.

N. Sykes.

Oxford.

Christianity according to St John. By W. F. Howard. Duckworth. 6s.

This is a useful addition to Duckworth's Studies in Theology. Dr Howard's Dale Lectures for 1940 consist of eight self-contained essays on different aspects of Johannine theology. It should prove an admirable introductory book for students, and has much to interest the more advanced reader. Even those whose approach is not academic will find that the themes here handled are sufficiently important to merit their grappling with the discipline of exact scholarship.

The chief excellence of the book lies in that it shows positively how best to read and study the Johannine writings. Much recent work on St John has been practically inhibited from understanding his meaning and purpose by misleading assumptions and false antitheses. For many in England Hoskyns's *Fourth Gospel* was the opening of a new era in interpretation. He showed the irrelevance of the old shibboleths by a

penetrating exegesis, itself a proof of his truer principles. Dr Howard's views were formed independently of Hoskyns, so that the extent of their agreement on principle is interesting.

The technical problem of the relation between St John and the Synoptists, particularly with regard to their historical divergences, has attracted to itself a disproportionate amount of attention. This is not to say that a theology which embraces history, whose Word was made flesh, can possibly ignore the problem. But to isolate it, and to force upon it an over-simple solution, has again and again led to futility. By some it has been assumed that St John's literal accuracy must be defended by various forms of special pleading; by others that his historicity can be thrown overboard, on the ground that the "spiritual" Gospel has no concern with history as such, but only uses historical symbols for eternal truths. But these attempts have got us nowhere; only by treating the subject-matter (theology) by a suitable (*i.e.*, theological) method is there a possibility of advance. In chapter I Dr Howard notes (pp. 21 *ff.*) three important emphases in St John's treatment of the evangelical material—*explicative*, *mandatory*, and *proleptic*. To distinguish these (especially the first and the third) is at least a useful beginning: they explain features of his writing, and suggest that his object is not to contradict the earlier Gospels on matters of fact but to clarify their μαρτυρία to *the* Fact. In later chapters he deals with other apparent divergences: *e.g.*, in eschatology in chapter V, over Miracles on pp. 156 *ff.*

Another common assumption has been that St John has more affinity with Hellenistic ideas than with Jewish faith, and much interpretation has worked on this premiss. But if his background is primarily Jewish (and Christian!), and only secondarily Greek, then the study of biblical language and a knowledge of rabbinics will help more towards his understanding than the closest familiarity with Philo and the Mysteries. On pp. 29 *ff.* Dr Howard justifies his conversion to the latter view; and in chapter II (The Logos of Life) gives the first of a number of illuminating applications.

Not a few sharp antitheses (*e.g.*, between history and faith, eschatology and mysticism, spiritual and sacramental religion) were foisted upon the New Testament by scholars influenced by alien dogmas. These are far less formidable when the material is handled according to the canons proper to theology. And this is very clearly brought out by the author.

In general there are few passages where this book does not carry conviction. Chapter III (Father, Son and Holy Ghost) is perhaps less successful than most in conveying St John's doctrine. To give several pages to Windisch's speculations on the five Paraclete sayings seems out of place in a book of this size, especially when they are discounted in the end.

Two small comments on chapter VI (Church, Ministry and Sacraments). (*a*) Although on p. 25 the "mandatory emphasis" of St John's writing is stressed, the Ministry is discussed without any reference to apostolicity—surely a strange omission; in a rather unhappy passage on John xx, 21-3, ver. 21 is quoted without comment. (*b*) On

p. 145, in the interesting section on the sacraments Dr Howard seems to use the phrase *ex opere operato* in a sense all his own, when he says that 1 Cor. x, 1 *ff.* "shatters any *ex opere operato* theory of sacramental grace"; this it could only do if grace *ex opere operato* implied that the recipient was automatically sanctified—but of course it does not.

Lastly: a pleasing feature of this book is that it contains several examples of continuous exegesis: pp. 87 *ff.* on viii, 21 *ff.*; pp. 138 *ff.* on x, 1 *ff.*

J. D. M. Stuart.

London.

Christ's Strange Work. (The Bishop of London's Lent Book.) By Alec R. Vidler. Longmans. 2s. 6d.

This is a pioneer work of Christian theology, written in plain English, which deserves our gratitude. It is an exposition of the relation between Law and Gospel in the Christian faith, in terms of the threefold use of the law—as means of preservation, as summons to repentance, and as guidance for the Church. This is done with a wealth of judicious quotation from theologians and expositors of Scripture, ancient and modern, which invites our further probing of the authors quoted. The general point of view may be exemplified as follows (pp. 43 *f.*): "There is a correspondence between the redemption of the old Israel from bondage in Egypt and the redemption of the new Israel from bondage to the Law, a correspondence which is reproduced in the continuing Acts of the Messiah in the Apostolic Church unto this day. In the first case we have (1) the bondage in Egypt, (2) the sacrifice of the Passover, (3) the miracle of the Exodus, followed by (4) the giving of the Old Law at Sinai. In the second case we have (1) the Messiah's voluntary submission to and fulfilment of the Old Law which is our bondage, (2) the sacrifice of the Cross at the feast of the Passover, (3) the miracle of the Resurrection, followed by (4) the giving of the New Law, the Grace of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost. . . . The redeeming Acts of the Messiah are continued and become really present to us through the proclamation of the Word and the administration of the sacraments in the Apostolic Church. (1) The teaching of the Law convicts us of our sin and bondage and brings us into the condition where we cry for deliverance. (2) The preaching of the Gospel convinces us that Christ our passover is sacrificed for us. . . . (3) Baptism is our Exodus, our deliverance from bondage; it effectually signifies both the burial of the old sinful nature, and also our being raised with the Messiah to newness of life. (4) The gift of the Spirit through the laying on of hands is our Pentecost, when we are made partakers of the New Law, the divine charity which is the fulfilment of Jeremiah's prophecy, and the promise and assurance of the Church's final sanctification."

Three comments may be made. (1) It might have been a good thing if the book had been reviewed by someone who dissented from the author's thesis in principle, though, in my judgment, to repudiate

the *kind* of thing which is here attempted means to subordinat theology to some other discipline, whether that be science, or history or literature. (2) Of course the treatment limps—we are given glimpse of the Promised Land, we do not enter in and possess it We are not yet ready to make a confident theological use of Hol Scripture on the basis of an assimilation of historical criticism—an the work of the theologian is held up at every turn on this account In 1895 the promoters of the International Critical Commentarie affirmed that there were plenty of homiletical commentaries on th Bible; what was needed was first-rate critical commentaries. Fift years later the boot is on the other foot. There is a great amount c critical work, but we are poorly equipped with expository commentaries At some points, of course, there is rich help from modern scholars; a other points what the believing Christian does with the passage i question is left completely out of account. But this book helps to poin the way. (3) I am not wholly in agreement with the author in hi dismissal of Natural Law, nor in his identification of the Mosaic Cove nant with the Decalogue. It is the preface to the Decalogue, rathe than the Decalogue itself, which is distinctive, and however untrust worthy in a radical crisis Natural Law may be, Christians have duty to insist on its existence and relative validity. But the principl Fr Vidler is laying down, which I should myself accept, is that Natura Law—the standard which should govern the life of man as man—i given content from the divine positive law of the Bible, *and not vic versa*. This principle, if accepted, would have a revolutionary effec on current habits of thought. I can only hope that the book wil provoke the really serious discussion it deserves.

H. Cunliffe-Jones.

Bradford.

Suffering, A Christian View. By M. Nédoncelle. Translated b M. Vernon. Burns Oates. 2s.

I am inclined to think that the Abbé Nédoncelle has given us classic, worthy to set beside Hinton's *Mystery of Pain*, which it equals i its depth of understanding and surpasses in its strong Christian assur ance. It gives us a true "anatomy of suffering," as Archbishop Downe rightly says. Its value, apart from its fine and sympathetic writing always full of suggestion, lies in its clear separation of the problem o pain from that of evil, in its full recognition that suffering is real an terrible, never to be sought for itself, and in its insight into the plac that suffering may take, for the Christian, in the purposes of God This book is a possession for all the Churches.

L. W. Grensted.

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher